

TWO GENUINE CONFERENCES

BETWEEN

Mr. JOHN GONSTON, commonly
called Dr. SHARPE, one of the most
Eminent among the *Romish* Priests, lately
Deceased;

AND

Mr. WILLIAM GUNBIE, a Layman of the
Church of *England*, now living at *Barnet* in
Hertfordshire;

On the SUBJECT of

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

LATELY HELD

At the *Pilgrim's* Coffee-House in *High-Holborn*,

To which is Prefix'd

Some Account of the Life and Character
of the said Dr. SHARPE; and his strenuous En-
deavours to convert Young Gentlemen and others,
to the ROMISH Religion; he having made more
Converts in England than all the Popish Priests besides.

43-4-6-717.

LONDON:

Printed for EDWARD WITHERS, at the *Seven
Stars*, against *Chancery-Lane* End in *Fleet-
Street*; and Sold by the Booksellers in Town
and Country.

(Price 6d. or 9s. a Dozen, to those who give them away.)



A
SHORT ACCOUNT
OF
Dr. SHARPE'S LIFE.

HE celebrated Dr. *John Sharpe*, who claims so great a share in the two following Conferences, was born in the Parish of *St. Dunstan's* in the West, *London*, in the Year 1688. His right Name was *Gonston*, being the Son of one *Gonston* a Cobler, who lived under the Wax Work in *Fleet-street* for many Years, and was Bellman of *St. Dunstan's* in the West; he was placed on the Foundation of *Merchant-Taylors* School in the Year 1701, and from thence he went to *Cambridge*; and on his coming to Town, at leaving the University, he being a very learned and ingenious Man, several Popish Priests introduced themselves into his Conversation, and were very busy in making him a Convert; which coming to the Knowledge of his Father, who, though poor, was very uneasy at the Thoughts

18

Thoughts of his Son's changing his Religion, and applied to Dr. *Lupton*, then Lecturer of St. *Dunstan's* in the West, desiring he would exert his utmost Abilities to dissuade him from it, and acquainted him with the Danger his Son was in from some Popish Priests; but the Doctor like a true dignified Clergyman, told him, *that it was not his Business, he had not the Cure of Souls*, and he must apply to Mr. *Jenks*, then Vicar, a very honest Man, though no great Scholar, and very unequal to such a Task; so the poor Man finding no Person, who would give themselves the Trouble of conversing with his Son, (it broke his Mother's Heart, who survived the hearing of her Son's abjuring his Religion but two Months.) The Popish Priests being very busy, they gained him over to their Religion, and sent him to *Rome*, where he was several Years among the *Jesuits*; and from thence he went to *Paris*, and was of the Order of *Mendicants*; after staying there a few Years, he came into *England*, and officiated in several of the Popish Chapels, and was one of the most active Popish Priests in *England*, and reckoned to have made more Converts than all the Priests besides.

He took frequent Occasions to introduce himself into several publick Societies, as the

Free-Masons, &c. where he got acquainted with abundance of young People, in order to make Converts; and he being a good Scholar, an excellent Companion, and a Man of Wit and Humour, he gained great Esteem among them. He was one of the Chaplains to his Excellency Count *Kinski*, the *Imperial* Minister, and was greatly respected among most of the Popish Families in *England*. He was Author of several Books, and had conducted the *Republick of Letters* for some Years. He died at his Lodgings near *Red-Lion Square*, on *Thursday, June 24*; and left all his Personal Effects, (by a *Noncupative Will* only,) to *Charles Umfreville*, commonly called *Dr. FELL*, an eminent *Romish* Priest, who renounced his Claim; and Administration has been granted to the next *Protestant Heir*.



(:)

T W O
CONFERENCES

Between

Mr. JOHN SHARP,

An Eminent

ROMISH PRIEST;

AND

Mr. W—. G—.

A Layman of the CHURCH of
England.

S verbal Disputes in Religion,
never have, that I know of,
proved convictive, where Op-
ponents have been nigh Equals
in Capacities and Reading ; therefore it
occasions many able Scholars to decline
them : especially, where the *Protestants*
of the Church of *England's* Cause is in

B

no

N. B. Such Parts of the following Pages, as are Com-
ma'd, thus, (") at the Beginning of the Lines, were no Part
of the Conferences.

no apparent Danger of being depreciated, by their Silence. However, at the *Punch-House* upon *Ludgate-Hill*, Mr. G——, one of those I last spoke of, was, unavoidably attack'd by Mr. W—— W—— a Layman of the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, upon the Article of *Transubstantiation*. Whether of the two had the Advantage, is not material ; but this was the Consequence—— The Day following, the Company agreed to bring Mr. G—— to a Dispute with Mr. —— *Sharp*, a Gentleman, who, as I have since been informed, commenced his first Studies at the University of *Cambridge* ; after that, studied the Law in the *Temple*, where he began to waver in his *Protestant Principles*, and incline to *Popery*. Whether he entirely threw off *Protestantism*, and conformed to *Popery*, whilst there, I cannot ascertain : But, I am credibly informed, that from thence he went to *France*, and so travelled on thorough, perhaps, all the *Popish* Countries in *Europe*, particularly *Italy*, and chiefly the City of *Rome* ; of which Church, I have great reason to believe, he is, now, a *Doctor in Divinity*.

WITH

WITH so able an Advocate of the *Romish* Church it was that Mr. G—— was to encounter ; and that too without so much as being apprised of it, because, his known Aversion (as I have already observed) to verbal Controversies, especially about Points of Faith, made those who intended their Conference, thus secretly contrive to bring him and Mr. *Sharp* together.

THAT my Reader may not conceive too great a Disparity of acquired Qualifications to be between the two Opponents, and so therefrom form too grand Notions of the *Anglican* Principles, and too mean of the *Romish*, it is necessary to acquaint him, that altho' Mr. G—— had been brought up a Mechanic, in which he continued upwards of eighteen Years, yet was not that Time wholly spent in the pursuit of his Trade ; but after the Fatigue of Business, the Liberal Sciences, or Conversation with Gentlemen of Letters, as Opportunities offered, took up the most part of his Leisure ; so that, in Natural Philosophy, &c. by those who knew him, he was thought no small Proficient ; nor was he an entire Stranger to the *Latin*, *Greek*, and *French* Languages.

guages. Besides, six Years he had been beyond Sea ; In which time he became a thorough Master of the *Swedes*, capable of reading the *German*, and was initiated into the *Hebrew* Tongues, at the University of *Upsala*, in *Sweden* : Also familiarly acquainted with most of the Professors, and subordinate *Literati* of that Fountain of Learning.

BUT, it must be allowed, that notwithstanding all these Benefits of Education, yet could not Mr. G—— be supposed to stand in any competition as to Acquirements, with Mr. *Sharp* ; who, besides all the Learning a Series of upwards of twenty Years Studies has furnished him with, by his Profession is to gainsay every *Hereſſy*, that is, every other Religion not subject to the *Papacy* ; likewise Mr. *Sharp* was apprized of the Meeting above a Month before, and I am fully persuaded that he was no Stranger to the Subject which was to be discoursed upon : whereas, on the contrary, I have reason to believe, that, until these two, Mr. G—— hath not had any essential Religious Dispute whatsoever, against the *Papists* for above twelve Years.

I SHALL not take notice how this Meeting was brought about, (which was at the *Pilgrim's Coffee-House by Little-Turn-Style, High-Holborn*) it administering no Light to the Arguments on either side; neither shall I trouble you with any farther previous Introduction; but, once for all, give you to understand, that all their Arguments turn'd upon the fore-mentioned Point of TRANSUBSTANTIATION; to which Discourse, induced, by what Mr. *W—— W——* had said, Mr. *G——* led the way, by this Negative Proposition, *viz.*

THAT the Elements of *Bread* and *Wine* could not be the real *Body* and *Blood* of our Saviour *Christ*, notwithstanding these Words of the Institution, *hoc est Corpus meum*; for, as he conceived, an *Impossibility* was imply'd in the bare Supposition, that *Body* can be in *two Places* at *one* and *the same* Period of Time.

MR. *Sharp*, (who I shall for the future call the *Doctor*, as I shall call Mr. *G——* the *Philosopher*, these being the Appellatives the Company distinguished the Gentlemen by) before he enter'd upon his Answer,

swer, was pleased to deny, that there was any such thing as *Space* or *Place*, or that there could be, in Fact, either *Vacuum* or *Plenum*, and by this he intended to evade the Expression, *in two Places*; which was, by the *Philosopher*, rather than dispute upon Words, granted; and the *Doctor* was likewise allowed to substitute in the place thereof, the Phrase *here* and *elsewhere*. Upon this Concession, the *Doctor* denied that the *Romans* ever intended the Expression, *hoc est Corpus meum*, to signify CHRIST's *natural Body*, but that the Elements were, upon the Priest's pronouncing those Words *transubstantiated* into Christ's *spiritual Body*; therefore he inferred, without proving it, that it was not *impossible*, but only *improbable*, that a *spiritual Body* could be *here* and *elsewhere* at *one* and *the same* Period of Time, as had been alledged before.

BUT this *Gratis dictum* not being convincing, Mr. *Philosopher* insisted upon its being *morally impossible*, that *Body* or *Matter*, as such, could be *here* and *elsewhere*, at *one* and the *same* Period of Time; and that it was as reasonable to assert its *Being* and *not Being*, or *Ens non Entite*, as that, whatever was supposed to exist, as *Matter*,

ter,
cou
else
Tim

P
Do
spir
com
Thi
very
Ma

T
stan
soph
it v
stan
spir
kin
wh
her
not
fati
ed,
Dis
ter
san
Tim
Sai
the

ter, under the Denomination of *Body*, could fill, employ or possess, *here* and *elsewhere*, at *one* and *the same* Period of Time.

PINCHED by this short Argument, the *Doct̃or* then insisted upon having this *spiritualized Body* stripp'd of *all* the Concomitant Appenages of *Length, Breadth, Thickness, Solidity*; and, in short, of every Accident *un-spiritualized* or *gross Matter* cannot exist without.

THIS also was granted; and notwithstanding so large a Concession, the *Philosopher* observed, that thus deprived of what it was impossible to deprive *material Substance* of, if still not annihilated, however *spiritualized*, it must remain subject to taking up *some Part* of the *here* and *elsewhere*; otherwise it could not be in the *here* and *elsewhere* at all; consequently, not at *one* and *the same* Time. But this not satisfying the *Doct̃or*, the *Doct̃or* affirmed, that two Bodies (without making any Distinction of *spiritual* or *gross Matter*) had been in *one*, and that too the very *same* Place, at *one* and *the same* Period of Time, as appeared from the Passage in *Saint John*, Chap. xx. ver. 19.—*When the Doors were shut, where the Disci-*

ples

ples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst. —

For how could CHRIST's *Body* pass into the Room, *the Doors being shut*, but that that very numerical identical Body, must have been in the *very Place* of either the *Door*, the *Walls* ? &c. And if it can be supposed, that two Bodies, *viz.* that of CHRIST and any other Body whatsoever, can be both in one Quantity of Space at *one* and *the same* Period of Time, why shall it be thought unreasonable to assert CHRIST's *Body* to be in *two* or *more* Places at *one* and *the same* Period of Time ?

“ It is to be observed, that tho' the
 “ *Doctor* had discarded all *Space, Place,*
 “ &c. when he thought so doing would
 “ serve a Turn, he now reassumes not on-
 “ ly the bare Expression, but connects
 “ to it the strongest *Idea* Locality can
 “ admit of. Yet, let it but be noted, how
 “ many Things unobserved to Persons
 “ when intent upon any one Subject or
 “ Contemplation, pass ; and it will be no
 “ difficulty to conceive not only a *Possi-*
 “ *bility*, but even a *Probability* (were we
 “ inclined, *blasphemously*, to invalidate
 “ this miraculous Appearance of our Sa-
 “ *viour*, amongst his Disciples) that whilst
 “ the

“ the Apostles were in the Extacy of De-
 “ votion, and believing themselves, at
 “ least so secure as to receive notice, should
 “ any one intend to molest them, how
 “ easy was it for our Saviour to intro-
 “ duce his Humanity amongst them, by
 “ the Door, before they were aware of
 “ it.” But this only by the bye; and to
 return to the Argument.

In Answer to what the *Doctor* had
 affirmed from this Text, the *Philosopher*
 replied, that CHRIST's appearing in the
 midst of the Disciples, all on a sudden,
the Doors being shut, carried no force
 with it to evince, that, therefore, two
 material Substances could be in *one* and
the same Place: For, to evince on the
 contrary, by a most familiar and uncon-
 testable parallel Comparison, he extended
 out his Arm, desiring the Company to
 observe his Hand which was spread abroad;
 how easily he contracted it into a narrow
 Compass, without doing any violence to
 it, and that by a Power only *communicated*
 to him by the All-wise Creator; and with
 the same Facility, 'twas undeniable, that
 he expanded it again, and again re-clinch-
 ed it. By which he inferr'd it to be in-
 finitely more easy, to conceive the Al-
 mighty contracting his *assumed Body*, yea,
 even

even into so narrow a compass, as to be capable of transmitting it through an Interstice so small, as no where can exist but in the Imagination.

FARTHER, he thought it highly derogatory from the Honour of God, to allow him to be capable of communicating, only by a LET IT BE, such an essential Faculty to the *Pippir* or *Kernel* of an *Apple*, as that it should become, or produce a large Tree, annually bearing great numbers of such productive *Semina*, and yet not to allow HIM so inconsiderable a Power over his *assumed Body*, as to be capable of re-contracting it so, as, without the least Difficulty, it might, imperceptibly pass through a Key-hole, or any other minuter Interstice; and, instantaneously, again, expand or modify the same contracted Body or Mass of Matter, into its complete Essentiality of Visibilty, or humane Appearance.

“ FOR my part, I confess, the two Arguments, the *Philosopher* has made use of to enforce the Unreasonableness of such a Supposition, as is that Assertion, *That two Bodies were in one Quantity of Space at one and the same Period of Time*, seem so conclusive, as I can
“ with

“ with far more ease conceive a Re-in-
 “ stating the *Humanity* or *assum'd Body*
 “ of CHRIST into its first *Principium* or
 “ Miniature ; a Possibility of the Re-
 “ obvelification of the multifarious Pro-
 “ ductions that had proceeded from the
 “ *Kernel* of an *Apple* in ten thousand
 “ Ages ; or, if you please, that the whole
 “ Mass of Matter composing the Uni-
 “ verse, might be reclaimed into so little
 “ Dimensions (without doing the least
 “ Violence to the Shape, Form or Vitals
 “ composing the Elephant, a Whale,
 “ the Sea, or any other Animate or In-
 “ animate Being) as to pass through the
 “ Eye of the smallest Needle, and *vice*
 “ *versa* ; than take in an *Idea* so absurd
 “ as is that Assertion of Two *Bodies be-*
 “ *ing* both in ONE *Quantity of Space at*
 “ ONE *and* THE SAME *Period of Time.*
 “ For if, without Difficulty, we can con-
 “ ceive the minutest Particle of Matter
 “ to be divisible *in Infinitum*, as we speak,
 “ nay and demonstrate the *Howness* (if
 “ I may be allowed the Expression) too ;
 “ and, from contemplating this *Howness*
 “ of *Divisibility*, we can form again an
 “ *Idea* of the least Particle of Matter's
 “ *infinite Extension*, or connect an *Idea*
 “ of *Infinite* to TIME, whether past or
 “ to come, so as to join it *to*, or make

“ it *One* with, *Eternal passive Duration*,
 “ yet not in the least degree adequate to,
 “ but as a meer *Parenthesis* in, *ETERNI-*
 “ *TY*; does, then, our *SAVIOUR*’s *bodily*
 “ coming into the Room, amongst his
 “ Disciples, *the Doors being shut*, tho’
 “ we should affirm it to have transmi-
 “ grated through the smallest Pore in the
 “ Glas, or any other infinitely minuter
 “ Interstice, carry any thing so absurd in
 “ it, as, that *ONE Adequate* can contain
 “ *Two Adequates*; or, which is the same
 “ thing, only in other Words, that *Two*
 “ *Quarts of Wine* can be, *BOTH TOGE-*
 “ *THER*, in *ONE Quart Pot*; or, in o-
 “ ther Terms, that a *PART* can contain
 “ *Two* of its *WHOLES*: which is to affirm
 “ *no more than* that *Two Bodies*, viz.
 “ the *Body* of *CHRIST* and any other *ma-*
 “ *terial Substance*, each alike in Dimen-
 “ sions, to *ONE similar Quantity* of
 “ *Space*, or (to use the *Doctor*’s abstract-
 “ ed Term) of the *here* and *elsewhere*,
 “ were contained in that *ONE Quantity*
 “ of *Space*, at *one* and *the same* Period
 “ of Time; which is, what the *Doctor*
 “ would have had given into, from the
 “ Words of *St. John* — *when the*
 “ *Doors were shut* — *came JESUS and*
 “ *stood in the midst* —.

“ THAT

" THAT the *Doctor* is so bad a Philo-
 " sopher, as this comes to, I am far from
 " believing; tho' really (without ever
 " endeavouring to prove his Assertion,
 " that Two *Bodies* were in ONE *Place*,
 " at one and the same Period of Time,
 " otherwise than by barely citing the
 " Words, *when the Doors were shut, &c.*)
 " he deduced therefrom this *False Con-*
 " clusion, viz. that ONE *Body* may be
 " in Two *Places*, consequently in *Two*
 " *thousand*, or *Two hundred thousand*
 " *Places*, at one and the same Period of
 " Time; than which to conclude, from
 " the Premises, admit the Pre-assertion
 " had been true, as it manifestly appears
 " it is not, nothing can be more mon-
 " strously absurd."

THE *Doctor*, not being capable to sup-
 port his Cause of *Transubstantiation*, by
 this Quotation from the Holy Evangelist,
 begg'd the Question, and said; But Mr.
Philosopher, you believe the TRINITY,
 why not TRANSUBSTANTIATION?

THE *Philosopher*, to this, answered;
 that the *Doctor* asserted he believed the
 TRINITY, was Fact; but suppose he
 should deny it, it then could make no-
 thing

thing for him. However, the *Philosopher* told him, to avoid Words, he acceded to his Assertion, that he believed the TRINITY ; yet he conceived it so far from being consequent upon his belief of the TRINITY, that he *ought*, or, as the *Doctor* would have it, if he could, *must*, believe TRANSUBSTANTIATION ; he thought it far more reasonable to assert, that because he knew and could prove that the *Doctor* had been eating, he could conclude, from that Action, that he had been dancing, which he could not prove. For, as for the TRINITY, that the *Philosopher* affirmed he could make out by Scripture, and likewise consistent with Humane Reason ; whereas TRANSUBSTANTIATION, had no Existence, either in Scripture, human Reason, or any where else but *human Invention*.

THE *Philosopher* acknowledging the TRINITY, the *Doctor* catch'd hold of this, as a fit Opportunity to pervade all farther Arguments about TRANSUBSTANTIATION ; therefore, the *Doctor* descended to argue about the insuperable Difficulty attending the proving a TRINITY in the *Godhead*, with regard to *Personal Unity* ; so, willingly, would have left TRANSUBSTANTIATION to its Self-Defence,

fence, and thereupon harangued, a considerable Time, in an argumentative way both *pro* and *con*, upon that Topic. To all which, the *Philosopher* made this short Reply.—Sir ! What does all this avail, towards proving the Matter in hand, TRANSUBSTANTIATION ? Or, how would our Reason receive any conclusive Light, as to TRANSUBSTANTIATION, from undeniable Evidence of the Verity of the TRINITY ? Therefore, he concluded it was entirely out of the Question ; consequently, so foreign to the Purpose, as not to merit, at that time, any farther Consideration. But, as the Case in Contrast was about the *Personal Presence* or *Non-presence* of the *Real Body* of CHRIST in the *Sacrament*, he desired the *Doctor* would, forbearing the Subject of the TRINITY, attend to what our *Saviour* CHRIST says, after the Institution ; *I will drink no more of the Fruit of the Vine, until I drink it new in my Father's Kingdom*. Now here, our blessed Saviour calls *the Cup of Blessing*, as St. Paul calls it, *the Fruit of the Vine*, and not his *Blood* ; therefore, by parity of Reason, if the *Wine*, after the Institution, which was certainly as efficacious as any Consecration since, still continued, without any *Transmutation*, much less a TRANSUB-

STAN-

STANTIATION, to be the *Fruit of the Vine*, consequent thereupon, after the Words, *hoc est Corpus meum*, pronounced over it, must still, notwithstanding, remain *Bread*, and not the *Body* of our Lord CHRIST (meaning, as is all along to be understood, CHRIST's glorified Body :) otherwise the Consecrated *Bread* would be *Transubstantiated* into CHRIST's *Body*, without *Blood*; or if the *Bread*, after Consecration, contained also CHRIST's *Blood*, then would the Consecrated *Wine* have the Substance of the *Body* in it; otherwise, if the *Wine* continued, notwithstanding its Consecration, still to be, really, *no more*, than the *Fruit of the Vine*, and the *Bread*, by its Consecration, assume into itself the *Blood* of CHRIST, then is the Sacrament of *Bread* and *Wine* both a *real Substance* of CHRIST's *Body* and *Blood*, and the *Sign of the Thing signified*; which to assert, how reasonable it was, he appealed.

To this, the *Doctor* offered no other Reply, than by asking, *If ever CHRIST drank New Wine in the Kingdom of Heaven?* Upon which, Mr. R— (one of the Company) without leave, entered the Lists, and generously gave up this Point, by declaring he thought it made

made nothing for the *Philosopher's* Purpose. But the *Philosopher*, several times going about to back his Argument, the *Doctor* evaded him by giving ear to Mr. R—; and as Mr. R— said, he thought it not much to the purpose, the *Doctor* dropp'd it, by saying to him, You know, Sir! 'twas not of my proposing, and therefore you see I am willing to give it up, but Mr. *Philosopher* is not.

It being Eleven o' th' Clock, which was later than the *Doctor* usually sits up, 'twas thought proper to depart, each one to his Place of Abode.

'Twas the general Opinion of the Company, that these two Disputants had so much of each other's Arguments, that, whenever they should again meet, *Religion* would be the last thing discoursed of between them. When, unexpectedly, the *Philosopher* desired Mr. B— (another who was present at the Conference) to present his Service to the *Doctor*, and let him know, he would be very glad to have a second Opportunity of discoursing with him upon the same Subject.

Mr. B— readily complied; and not only acquainted the *Doctor*, who as readily accepted the Offer, but likewise the rest of the Company, who all were well
D pleased;

pleased ; and accordingly, with the Consent of the two Gentlemen, Time and Place was appointed.

THE Company met, when after Mr. *Philosopher* had entertained them, a-while, with some of his own Improvements in Mathematicks, Silence seemed to bespeak the Company's desire the Contrast should begin.

THE *Doctor*, whose the Right of Pre-eminence all the Company judged, from his Seniority, and Ecclesiastical Dignity, was to begin, (altho' Mr. *Philosopher* had given the Invitation) seemed not over-desirous of it, as was thought by those present ; because his Discourse turned chiefly upon Matters merely Philosophical. But as it would have been dishonourable, as well as given cause for the Company to imagine the *Philosopher*, from a Diffidence of his Ability to support the Foundation of the Meeting, to have letten 'em pass the Evening without the least Entertainment of *That* Kind expected, Mr. *Philosopher* begg'd their Leave to re-assume the Subject which had been discoursed of, between him and the *Doctor*, when last they were together. The *Doctor's* ready Assent to the *Philosopher's* Propo-

Proposition, prevented the Company's making any other Answer, than, *Ay! with all their Hearts*, tho' every one's Countenance seem'd to glow through inward Satisfaction. Upon this, the *Philosopher*, with Deference to the Company, addressing himself to the *Doctor*, observed, that the *Thesis* he had advanced, the last time they had been together, was,

THAT the Elements of *Bread* and *Wine* could not be the real *Body* and *Blood* of CHRIST; for, as he conceived, an *Impossibility* was implied in the bare Supposition, that *Body* can be in *two Places* at *one* and *the same* Period of Time. To which, he observed, the *Doctor* had, in order to set this aside, denied the Existence either of *Space* or *Place*, and, thereupon, by mutual Consent, the Term *two Places*, was changed for that of *here* and *elsewhere*. After that, he took notice, that the *Doctor* had stripp'd *Body* of all it's Appennages of *Length*, *Breadth*, *Thickness*, &c. and thereby had proceeded to assert, that by the Words, *hoc est Corpus meum*, the *Roman-Catholicks* did not mean the *Corruptible*, but the *Incorruptible*, *Body* and *Blood* of CHRIST, as it was glorified from the *Natural* to the *Spiritual Body*, by the Efficaciousness of

the Words of the Institution, when pronounced, by a regular ordered Priest, over the Elements of *Bread* and *Wine*, when consecrating them.

* To the no small surprize of the *Philosopher*, the *Doctor* denied, that ever he had once thought of the Consecrated Elements being the *Spiritual Body* of CHRIST; but that it was always looked upon, by the *Roman-Catholicks*, to be his real Substance of *Flesh* and *Blood*.

THIS Negation of the *Doctor's* being positively insisted upon, tho' I will not say, how unjustly, yet the *Philosopher* desisted from his Assertion, to give room for the *Doctor* to state the Matter in a light the most consistent with the *Popish* Doctrine of TRANSUBSTANTIATION, that, in their Conference, there might be no more *such like* Negatives.

UPON this so positive Negation of the *Doctor's*, and the *Philosopher's* desisting, 'tis obvious that part of the former Dispute, relating to the Possibility of *Body's* being *here* and *elsewhere*, was, by the *Doctor*, no more to be meddled with,

* This was the Motive which induced our Author to recollect what had pass'd between the *Doctor* and *Philosopher*.

as will plainly appear from his thus stating the Matter;

THAT our Saviour, when he instituted the *Blessed Sacrament* in Commemoration of his Passion, Sufferings and Death, took BREAD and brake it, and said, *Take, eat, THIS is my BODY, &c.* Now, he infer'd, from our Saviour's very Words, that, altho' it was *very* BREAD at the breaking, yet, at the Institution, it, instantaneously, became the *real* BODY of CHRIST; otherwise, we must charge our *Blessed Saviour* either with talking *inconsistently*, or, with *telling a Lye*. For, if our Saviour called it HIS BODY, when it was not so, but *really* BREAD, if we would not allow it to be talking *incongruously*, he certainly must be said to have spoken with the greatest Impropriety of Expression: But, if we would not charge our Saviour with having been guilty of an Impropriety of Expression, at least it must be a LYE; because, our Saviour had said, before the Institution, *Hitherto I have spoken to you in PARABLES, but I will no more speak to you in PARABLES*. Now, if CHRIST told his Disciples, he would *no more* speak to them in *Parables*, that is, by *Tropes* and *Figures*, but *plainly*, he could not be said to keep his Word

Word to them, if he called, what *really* was BREAD, his BODY ; or, if it was *really* his BODY, but he expressed himself so *unintelligibly* to them, as they apprehended him not to mean his BODY, tho' He *who could not lye*, told them so ; but that they took it, that he designed they should understand the Word BODY to mean BREAD, sure he could not be said to speak *plainly*, as he had promised, but *parabolically* or *mysteriously*, which was in effect to hyperbolize. Here Mr. R—— broke in, to urge the old beaten Argument, that, by the same way of Reasoning, our *Saviour* might, and ought to be looked upon as a *Way*, a *Door*, a *Vine*, &c. Which the *Doctor*, by a Sleight, deavoured to answer thus :

WHEN our *Saviour* saith, I am the *Way*, a *Door*, a *Vine*, &c. 'tis obvious that he speaks metaphorically ; because, he joins the Pronoun *I* and Verb-Substantive, *am*, in such a manner to the Words *Way*, *Door* and *Vine*, as plainly denotes them to be spoken of his Personality, which it was impossible should be either a *Way*, a *Door*, or a *Vine* ; therefore could not be understood literally, but in a metaphorical Sense, as more plainly appear'd, from our *Saviour* CHRIST's calling

ling himself the *Truth* and the *Light*, that is, *I am*, or *I shew the Way* ; *I am*, or *I open* unto you a *Door*, and the like. But, as in the Institution, there is no respect had to the *Personality* of CHRIST, but the Words were spoken of the BREAD that was broken, *this is my BODY*, so, thereby, was meant the *very BODY* of CHRIST. Mr. R—— was about to make a farther Reply ; when the *Doctor* desired him to be silent, telling him he had no Business to meddle in the Affair. Upon this, the *Philosopher* began ;

I THINK, *Doctor*, with submission, you wrest the Meaning of the Words, *This is my Body* ; for, it is always the Rule to come at the true Sense and Meaning of a *Relative*, to have Reference to some *Antecedent* ; “ and never, that I “ know of, is it to be explained by any “ thing coming after.” Now, ’tis plain from the very Words, that the *Antecedent* to the *Relative*, THIS is BREAD ; “ for “ ’tis said, in the Institution, JESUS took “ BREAD, and blessed it, and brake it, and “ said, Take, eat, THIS is my BODY ; that “ is, as I take them to mean, JESUS took “ BREAD and blessed IT, [BREAD] and “ brake IT, [BREAD] and said, take “ [BREAD,] eat [BREAD,] THIS [IT, “ BREAD]

“ BREAD] is (now instituted to be made
 “ use of as a perpetual Commemoration
 “ of) my BODY, which is given for
 “ You.”

THIS Construction of the Words, with respect to the *Antecedent* and *Relative*, the *Doct̃or* allowed of, as to the manner of *English* ; but he said, the way to come at the true purport of the Institution must certainly be, by having recourse to the Original, which was by the *Philosopher* agreed to ; so the *Doct̃or* rehearsed these original Words of the Institution, λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν ἄρτον, — καὶ εἶπε λάβετε, φάγετε τὐτὸ ἐν τῷ σῶμα μου. (*labōn o Iesous ton arton, — cai eipe Labete, phagetetouto estito swma mou.*) Where, he desired it might be observed, that it was not οὗτος. (*outos*) the masculine Gender, which it ought to have been, if it had referred to ἄρτος, (*artos*,) and not τὐτό (*touto*,) the neuter Gender, which plainly shewed it to belong to σῶμα (*swma*,) as it was rightly translated in the Latin, *hoc est Corpus meum*. Besides, added the *Doct̃or*, this is Mr. *Calvin's* Opinion, and sure, Sir, you will not deny that.

BUT the *Philosopher* told him, the Case in dispute was not what was Mr. *Calvin's*

vin's Opinion ; for, Mr. Calvin's religious Sentiments were well known not to be, in every degree, the Sentiments of the Church of England ; nor, if they were, was that any thing to the purpose between them two, at that Time. For, what he (the *Philosopher*) asserted, was, That the Elements of BREAD and WINE, (notwithstanding the Word of the Institution, was τῆτό) if St. Paul be allowed a faithful Expositor of the Texts recording the holy Institution, still remain so, as appears from the 11 Chap. I *Corinthians*, v. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. *For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same Night in which he was betrayed, took Bread : And when he had given Thanks, he brake it, [Bread,] and said, Take, eat ; THIS [Bread] is my Body, which is broken for you : This do in Remembrance of me. After the same Manner also he took the Cup, when he had supped, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood : This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For, as often as you eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this Bread, and drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilt-*

ty of the Body and Blood of the Lord. But let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup. In this Passage, St. Paul, as tho' he had foreseen the Errors Mankind would run into, about the BREAD's being supposed to be *transubstantiated* into the *Gross Compages* of the LORD's BODY, from the Words of the Institution, *This is my Body*, prefaceth his Exposition of them thus, *I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you*; so that his interpreting the Words, *this is my Body*, not to mean the real assumed *Body* of CHRIST, but BREAD broken, for a Remembrance; he tells the *Corinthians*, That this his Interpretation of the Words of the Institution, was what he had *received of the Lord*, which was, that notwithstanding CHRIST had called it his BODY, saying, *Take, eat; this is my BODY, which is broken for you*: Then he subjoins, *this do*, that is, *give Thanks and break BREAD*, in like manner as I have done, *in Remembrance, or for a Remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this BREAD, and drink this CUP*, i. e. Eat BREAD and drink WINE, thus hallowed, *ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this* (consecrated) BREAD, *and drink this* (con-

(consecrated) CUP OF (and not which, IS)
the Lord, &c.

FARTHER, if I be indulged to translate λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν ἄρτον, in a definite Sense, JESUS *took* a LOAF, *or* CAKE, (and, with humble Deference to the Learned, this seems to me to be the true Meaning of our Saviour's Words; and not in an indefinite, [BREAD] but a Passover Cake;) then it will be undeniable, That, when our Saviour first instituted his Holy Supper (and that Institution was to be the Standard Manner of Communion, to all succeeding Generations) he broke *That ONE Bread-Loaf, or Cake*, and not MANY of them, in token of his ONE *Body*; for he certainly had no more than ONE *Body*, which, shortly after, was to be broken; and distributed of that same ONE *Bread* to every one of his Disciples. So that to say, that every of our *Saviour's* Disciples received *one whole* CHRIST, is to say, that CHRIST *created*, at the Time of the Institution, to himself, so many humane Corporities, as there were Persons to whom he gave of that *broken Bread*, which *He*, by way of Metaphor, calls his BODY.

E 2

AND,

AND, should this be admitted, that CHRIST, by his Omnipotency, did so create a Number of *Reasonable Souls* and *Humane Bodies* co-subsisting, they must either subsist *conjunctly* and *separately*, otherwise they cannot, *truly*, be affirmed to be, the *very* FLESH, BLOOD and BONES, as the *Papists* do, of our *Saviour* CHRIST. Yea, that it is that very *Body* of CHRIST, *which was conceived, &c. Suffered under Pontius Pilate. Was crucified. Died; was Buried; descended into Hell, [Hades;] rose again the third Day from the Dead, [and forty Days after] he ascended into Heaven, and [now, corporally] sitteth at the Right Hand of God the Father Almighty, from thence he, [that glorified Assump-Corporiety of CHRIST, which, when upon Earth, did, and, now, doth (or it cannot be Body) employ some Part of Space, or the Here or elsewhere] shall come to judge [both they who shall yet be born, as well as] the Quick and the Dead. I say, admitting all this, which we must do, otherwise the Consecrated Elements cannot possibly be the same identical Body of CHRIST, neither to every, much less to any one Communicant; which is to assert no less, than, That *Man* [Sin and Impurity] can, and does, at pleasure, make*

de

de novo, his CREATOR [Original Purity] his GOD. But, this I expect will be denied ; because, consequent upon such an Assertion, every *Priest*, when consecrating the Symbolical Elements, brings to his Hand this very Body of CHRIST.

WERE I inclined to be ludicrous, upon this Sacred Subject, I could trifle away my Readers Time, in observing to them, how *necessary* it is, that our *Saviour* CHRIST should be, not only Omnipotent, but almost, in his Humanity, numerically Infinite, purposely to oblige the *Papists* ; otherwise, how could he be supposed, *bodily*, to descend from Heaven, to transmigrate from Belly to Belly, as often as they shall receive the Blessed Sacrament ; and again, as often, *incarnate*, re-ascend to a Re-union with his glorified Body ?

BUT the *Doctor*, in Answer to what Mr. *Philosopher* had here said, inferred, that if St. *Paul's* Words were to be taken in a literal Sense, and the Word BREAD was to be restrained to what is usually meant by BREAD, then must, consequently, the Word CUP, be confined, to the CHALICE or *Vessel*, and not to any thing therein : so, he said, in the Sacrament,

crament, the *CUP it self* was, by this Interpretation, enjoined to be imbibed, which, he presumed the *Philosopher* would not allow.

To this, Mr. *Philosopher* replied, That he thought a Metaphor so obvious as this, of the *Cup's* being put for whatever was in it, could not have possibly been misapplied. For, he was very sure, the *Doctor* well understood, that as by *eating Bread*, was usually comprehended all the Provisions at an Entertainment; so by taking the *Cup*, was signified also what was potable in it, as appeared by these Expressions, *As oft as ye drink it*, v. 25. *drink this Cup*, v. 26, and 27. *drink OF that Cup* (not THE Cup) v. 28, and v. 29. *drinketh unworthily*, ——— *drinketh Damnation*, being connexed.

HERE Mr. *R*—— was going to interfere, which occasioned some sharp Words between him and the *Doctor*. But, by the Mediation of the Company, their wrangling ceased. So the *Philosopher* went on farther to enforce his Assertion, that the Consecrated Elements still continued to be BREAD and WINE after they were consecrated, as plainly appeared from the Words of St. *Matthew*, Chap. xxvi.

v. 29.

v. 29. (which he had cited, as he observed, just before the Close of the first Evening's Conference;) *But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of THIS Fruit of the Vine, until that Day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom.* Where, by the Particle *This*, Mr. *Philosopher* inferred, was plainly indicated no other Potable to be meant, than that, which had been then consecrated, and, which our *Saviour* expressly calls *THIS Fruit of the Vine*, and not *this*, which was, before Consecration, but *now is not, the Fruit of the Vine.* " Altho' this
 " Text seems undeniably to evince the
 " Truth of what Mr. *Philosopher* asserted,
 " by its being said, *THIS Fruit of the*
 " *Vine*, yet, the following Passage from
 " St. *Mark*, Chap. xiv. v. 25. *Verily,*
 " *I say unto you, I will drink no more of*
 " *the Fruit of the Vine, until that Day*
 " *that I drink it new in the Kingdom*
 " *of God*; puts this Point beyond Dis-
 " pute, in my humble Opinion. For, al-
 " tho' the generality of Commentators
 " are of Opinion, that the Particle *THIS*,
 " in the first cited Text, is so corroborat-
 " ing, that it cannot *fairly* be denied,
 " but that it was *WINE* which our *Savi-*
 " *our CHRIST* spoke of, and not his *very*
 " *BLOOD*, notwithstanding he himself had
 " hallowed

“ hallowed it by the Words of Institu-
 “ tion ; and that it carrieth far more
 “ Force in it, than the Text cited from
 “ *St. Mark* ; yet, in my Judgment, the
 “ Particle *THE* is of greater Energy than
 “ the Particle *THIS*. For the Particle
 “ *THIS* manifestly was confined to that
 “ very Portion of *WINE* then, by the
 “ very *first* Act of Institution, consecrated ;
 “ which, we may presume, was all to
 “ be drank at that very Time. Where-
 “ fore, ’twas needless for our *Saviour*
 “ to say, he would drink no more of
 “ *THIS Fruit of the Vine*, had it not been
 “ to prevent the Disciples from a gross
 “ Mistake, which possibly they might
 “ fall into, by our *Saviour’s* saying, *this*
 “ *is my Blood*, tho’ he adds, *of the*
 “ *New Testament*, if he had not sub-
 “ joined, *This Fruit of the Vine*, thereto ;
 “ whereas the Particle *THE* so fully ex-
 “ presseth it to be *WINE*, that it seems
 “ to imply thus much, *Verily—I will*
 “ *drink no more of THE Fruit of THE*
 “ *Vine* (no, not even tho’ Consecra-
 “ ted).”

WHAT Mr. *Philosopher* argued, a-
 bout the conclusive Energy of the Parti-
 cle *THIS*, the *Doctor* took no manner of
 notice of in the least. But, instead of
 doing

doing that, which would have been the fair way of disputing, he asked, If ever our *Saviour* CHRIST had drank *New Wine* in the Kingdom of Heaven? As he had done the first Night.

THIS *doughty Question* was easily answered, by the *Philosopher's* telling the *Doctor*, that, he believed all Mankind looked upon the Words, NEW WINE, ought to be taken in a metaphorical Sense; for, he doubted not, he said, but the *Doctor* himself would look upon One, who, by the Expressions, *New Jerusalem*, *New Heaven*, *New Man*, should say, was to be understood a *New built City* (taking it in a literal Sense,) or that, *Jerusalem*, as it signifies *Heaven*, and a *New Heaven*, should mean a *new Place of Happiness* or *New Mansions for the Blessed*; if so? then it was not unreasonable to infer, by the same way of Reasoning, by a *New Man*, was meant a Body, in no wise partaking of its first Humanity; and such was it, to ask if ever our *Saviour* CHRIST drank *new Wine* in the Kingdom of Heaven? Therefore, he insisted upon the Particle THIS, undeniably to imply, as much as if our Saviour had said thus much; JESUS took the Cup, and consecrated what was in it, which was WINE,

F and

and gave it to his Disciples, saying, *Drink ye all of it : For this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is* (in effect, by this my Institutive Act of Consecration, already) *shed for many for the Remission of Sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of THIS* (Potable, which is verily, notwithstanding I have eucharistized it) *Fruit of this Vine, until that Day when I drink it New with you in my Father's Kingdom: Or, as St. Mark has it, in the Kingdom of God.*

ALL this said notwithstanding, by Mr. *Philosopher*, as to the Particle *THIS*, yet, the *Doctor* took no notice of it, but went about to evade it, by saying there were *two Cups* spoken of by the Evangelists. So, accordingly thereto, the *Doctor* read the 17, 18, 19 and 20 v. of the 22 Chap. of St. *Luke's Gospel*. For *he took the Cup and gave Thanks, and said, take this, and divide it among your selves. For I say unto you, I will not drink of the Fruit of the Vine, until the Kingdom of God shall come.* This, the *Doctor* observed, to be spoken of the *Wine*, at Supper, before the Institution of the Sacrament, which was in the following Words ; *And he took Bread, and gave Thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my Body which is given for you : This do*
in

in Remembrance of me. Likewise the Cup, after Supper, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you. Therefore, he said, it was plain, there were *two* Cups spoken of.

No Part of this Observation of the *Doctor's*, was, by the *Philosopher*, denied. But, the *Philosopher*, not willing to give up what he had inferr'd of the Particle *THIS*, without a Direct Answer, asked the *Doctor*, What he intended by observing, there were *two* Cups spoken of by *St. Luke*? For, he thought, that altho' there were *two* or *twenty* Cups mentioned, seeing only one of them was Eucharistical, they no ways invalidated *St. Matthew's* Assertion, That it was the *real* Fruit of the Vine; *THIS*, altho' eucharistized, *Fruit of the Vine*.

THE *Doctor* finding the *Philosopher* would not go from the Words of *St. Matthew*, *THIS Fruit of the Vine*, either, without he would give into it, or, say something directly in answer to it, was obliged to proceed upon it. And, there-upon said, that as *St. Luke* had written his Gospel, after *St. Matthew's* and *St. Mark's*, therefore *St. Luke's* was an Explanation of theirs; and he had applied

CHRIST's saying, *he would not drink of the Fruit of the Vine, until the Kingdom of God shall come*, expressly, to the *Wine* they were drinking of, at Supper, and before the Institution of the Sacrament.

UPON the *Doctor's* asserting this Passage of St. *Luke's* to be an Explanation of St. *Matthew's* and St. *Mark's*, the *Philosopher* asked him, if St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* had writ their Gospels by the same divine Influence as had St. *Luke*? Which, as the *Doctor* could not deny, therefore the *Philosopher* insisted upon it, that what was *valid* Evidence in Civil, was *equally so* in Ecclesiastical Cases; *viz.* That where *three* Witnesses of *equal* Credit (and undoubtedly such were the Apostles in every degree) seemed to contradict one another, *Two* against *One*, it was ever looked upon to be the *prudentest*, and, I think, I may venture to say, the *safest* way, to acquiesce with the *Two* rather than the *One*.

THIS, the *Doctor* was so far from denying, that he gave his Assent to the whole, so far as to confess, that, *according to humane Reason and Philosophy*, he could not but say Mr. *Philosopher* seemed to be in the right; but, added he, we believe the

the Word of GOD, as it is Literally spoken, *hoc est Corpus meum, this is my Body, and we believe the CHURCH's Interpretation thereof* : “ Meaning, as all “ *Roman Catholicks* do, by the Word “ CHURCH, no other CHURCH or CON- “ GREGATION whatever, but the---I “ don't know where to fix it, of ROME. “ For, they must be very Strangers to the “ *Divisions* of the *Papists*, who are not “ apprized of the Differences amongst “ them, upon this Head. Not to men- “ tion their Minion INFALLIBILITY, “ which some of their most favoured “ Doctors have asserted to be solely in the “ POPE ; whilst others have as strenuously “ avouched it to be the Property of *Ge- “ neral Councils*, allowing his *Holiness*, “ (as they, *blasphemously*, stile him) no “ more INFALLIBILITY than as a Mem- “ ber, actually present, in a *General “ Council* ; and others again assert, there “ can be no INFALLIBILITY but where “ both the POPE and a *General Council* “ are united. But, I confess, what I here “ have said is foreign to our purpose.”

MR. R—— here again interfered, which occasioned such Warmth between him and the *Doctor*, as entirely put a stop to farther Arguments.

THE

THE Parties appeased, the *Doctor* began to accuse all Mankind, meaning principally the Learned of the *Anglican* Communion, of *Pride of Judgment*, who would not believe the plain *Word* of God, because it thwarted what they, as he termed it, called their Reason. But, after the *Doctor* had gone on in this way of dogmatically exclaiming against Persons for *Unbelief*, because they would not lay aside those five singular Blessings, the *Senses*, and believe things point-blank against the Evidence the gracious God who gave them, ordained them to be, and by which all the World, yea, even the *Doctor* himself, governed all his moral Actions, the *Philosopher* (without reflecting upon that Uncharitableness inherent to the *Popish* Principles) told the *Doctor*, that he thought it an ungenerous Censure, to, without the least Reserve of Expression, accuse all the Members of a Certain Church, of so black a Crime as *Pride of Judgment* against their God; and, withal, declared himself to be of Opinion, that the Generality of those who had, for Ages past, as well as others, who might, for Ages to come, employ their Talents upon Religious Disputes, be they of what Profession soever, had the Conversion

version of their Fellow-Creatures, who dissent from them, from the imagined Errors of their Ways, at Heart ; but, chiefly, they aimed at Self-Conviction.

THIS Declaration of the *Philosopher's*, broke that Discourse ; and it being beyond the *Doctor's* usual time of sitting up, the *Doctor* gave the *Philosopher* a general Invitation, with an assured Welcome, at all Times, to him at his Lodgings. Thus concluded the Evening——

Naturam Hominis hanc Deus esse voluit, ut duarum Rerum cupidus & appetens esset ; Religionis & Sapientia.

LACTANT. Inst. L. iii. C. II.





AS I have hitherto given the Substance of what pass'd between the two Gentlemen, so far as I can remember ; I shall subjoin my Sentiments of what it is that the *Philosopher* would be understood to mean, when he denies the *Eucharistized* BREAD and WINE to be the *real* BODY and BLOOD of our *Saviour* CHRIST, which, by our *Catechism*, we are instructed to *declare* and *believe*, is, *verily and indeed taken and received, by the Faithful, in the Lord's Supper*. And this from another short Conference, I was present at, between Mr. *Philosopher* and a Layman of the Communion of the Church of ROME.

AND here, previous to what I shall say, in particular, as to these Words, it will be requisite to take the Prefatory Questions and Answers of our Church's Catechism, relating to the *Sacrament*, in order to come at their true Sense and Meaning.

Quest.

Quest. *Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?*

Ans. *For a continual Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, and of the Benefits we receive thereby.*

Quest. *What is the Outward Part or Sign of the Lord's Supper?*

Ans. *Bread and Wine, which the Lord commanded to be received.*

Quest. *What is the Inward Part or Thing signified?*

Ans. *The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received, by the Faithful, in the Lord's Supper.*

Now, the Stress of the Matter, by the Roman Catholick, was fixed upon these last Words, *The BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper.* Whereupon, he peremptorily said, the Compilers of the *Catechism* primarily declared, they be-
G
lieved

lieved the *real* BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST to be personally *present* after Consecration, and not the *Symbolical Elements* of BREAD and WINE. And that this was the Church's Opinion, appeared undeniably, from the Compilers having enforced this their Determination with a double Affeuration, *Verily and Indeed*, according to the literal Meaning of the Words.

THAT the *Papists* do by this, as they do by every Quotation they make, pick and cull, either whole or parts of Sentences or Paragraphs, &c. as best makes for their Purpose, without ever regarding the Context, is a Truth a little Consideration of the above cited Words will evince. For, to the first of these Questions; *Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?* I think, to Persons not swayed by the height of Delusion and Bigotry, the next Answer, with what follows upon the Sacrament, makes it as clear as the Day. For the Answer, &c. says, It was ordained, *For a CONTINUAL REMEMBRANCE of the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST, (not for a continual Manducation of the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST) and of the Benefits we receive thereby (from)*
the

the Outward Part or Sign of the Lord's Supper—BREAD and WINE, which the Lord commanded to be received (whereby) the Inward Part or Thing signified, the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST, are verily and indeed taken and received, by the Faithful (and not by the Unfaithful, which they also must inevitably take and receive, as oft as they should communicate, were it the gross Compages of CHRIST's BODY) in the Lord's Supper.

BUT, say they, *If the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST are verily and indeed taken and received, by the Faithful, in the Lord's Supper, then is it really and in Substance eaten, or manducated as you call it, by those Faithful; and if it be really and substantially manducated by the Faithful, it must also be eaten by the unworthy Communicant; otherwise which way can the unworthy Receiver, either be guilty of the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST his Saviour, or eat and drink his own DAMNATION; as in the third Exhortation of your Church's Communion, the unworthy Communicant is said, expressly to do? Besides, we apprehend, if the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST be only eaten and drunken by the Faithful, and*

not by the *unworthy Communicant* (not to suppose, with the *Anglican Church*, all are *Unworthy*) then the Consecrated Elements are a *Sacrament* in the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST to the *Faithful*, but to the *Unfaithful*, neither a *Sacrament* nor the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST ; which, to us *Roman Catholics*, seems to dictate either an Absurdity, or a Contradiction to Reason, at the least.

WERE we to allow, what the *Romanists* assert, that the Consecrated Elements are the real FLESH and BLOOD of our Saviour CHRIST ; then, indeed, in that sense, to say, that *the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST are verily and indeed taken and received by the FAITHFUL (only,)* and not by the UNFAITHFUL, *in the Lord's Supper*, would contain an Absurdity too gross to be imbibed, by the most shallow Capacity. But, admitting the Elements of BREAD and WINE, by Consecration, *Eucharistized*, and not *Transubstantiated* ; that is, as I take Mr. *Philosopher* to mean by the Word *eucharistized*, sanctified, so as to be efficacious to all the Intents of Man's Salvation our Saviour CHRIST designed the Elements of BREAD and WINE, by the influensive Power of the

the HOLY GHOST, through HIS Institution, were to be productive of; then, the next Catechetical Question, *viz.* *What are the Benefits whereof we are Partakers thereby?* and its Answer, *The strengthening and refreshing of our SOULS by the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST, as our BODIES are by the BREAD and WINE,* sufficiently clear the Point: for, as the sick Body receives little or no Nourishment from eating *Bread and Wine*, but oftener Harm upon it, so, the *Unworthy Communicant*, tho' he may manducate ever so often the *Eucharistized* Elements, yet his SOUL receives no saving *Benefit*, nor, as the Words themselves are, is it *strengthened or refreshed* thereby; but *eats and drinks its own Damnation, not discerning the LORD's BODY.*

THERE is one Assertion which the *Papists* make, relating to the Sacrament, that, at present, occurs to my Memory, which, I think I ought not to pass by un-taken notice of; tho' it came not in the way of Argument, either between the *Doctor* and the *Philosopher*, or the *Philosopher* and the forementioned *Lay-Popish-Disputant*. And, that is this, to wit,
 "That every Communicant, of the Po-
 " pish

“*pish Church, actually, and not virtu-*
 “*ally, only, receives One whole CHRIST,*
 “*or, CHRIST's real assumed Body which*
 “*suffered Death upon the Cross*”

ONE would think, that, when it is considered how each *Papish* Communicant, at the Time of communicating, only participates of the *symbolical Emblem* of CHRIST's *Body*, the *WAFER*, and never partakes of that of his *Blood*, the *WINE*, but he who administers drinks it for them; such an Assertion as, “That each Communicant manducates *One whole CHRIST, actually, and not virtually only,*” stands self-convict of *Absurdity*, and needed no farther Argument to confute it. But, willing, if possible, to clear up that *Blindness*, I had almost said *Perverseness* of Heart predominant with the *Papists*, and to remove every Stumbling-block, preventing their turning from the *Error of their Ways*; I, therefore, submit the following short Argument, upon this Matter, to the Consideration, Censure and Judgment of every impartial Reader.

THAT the *PASCHAL LAMB* was the justest Type of our *Blessed Saviour's* Sufferings,
 and

and the truest Prefiguration of the Sacrament's Institution, is, by all *Christian* Interpreters, allowed. (As for *Jews, Mahometans, &c.* they are out of the Question.) Now—As the PASCHAL LAMB was not eaten WHOLLY, of a WHOLE LAMB, by every single Person, so, neither is the WHOLE BODY of CHRIST, to be communicated, by each Communicant, Separately. But, the Consecrated BREAD and WINE is the WHOLE EFFICACIOUS CHRIST, to every Congregation of *Christians*, when communicating; To *Condemnation*, to the Unrighteous and Wicked, and *Salvation* of every one who receives, having on the *Marriage-Garment*, in like sort, as the PASCHAL LAMB was to each congregated Family of *Jews*. Besides, as at the *Paschal Supper*, the *Jews* were enjoined to have ONE whole Lamb; (they were not to have two or more, were the Family ever so numerous) and where a Family was too few to eat it all, they were to congregate themselves with their Neighbours; so that, 'tis plain, the Design of the *Passover* was so far from appointing ONE WHOLE, to every Person, that there was an Indulgence made them of burning what should remain, when there could not

not assemble together so many as could eat up *one whole Paschal Lamb*.

THAT this seems to be no more than a just Comparison between the *Jewish* and *Christian Passover*, the *Jews*, under their present Dispersion, seem to give into; by their Manner of celebrating the *Passover*, when wanting Number, where they have the Liberty, to manducate a *whole Lamb*, as God, by *Moses*, appointed they should. For, upon such like Exigencies, so many as assemble together, to eat the *Passover*, take an EGG, and that but ONE; or, if a Single Person celebrates it, He also takes ONE WHOLE EGG; so that, *one* Person eats, Symbolically, ONE WHOLE *Paschal Lamb*: And so, in like sort, if any Number, less than can manducate a Lamb, celebrate, they also take but ONE EGG, whereby, by every one's *participating* of the same, they as truly eat the *Passover*, as does he who eats one WHOLE (as suppose a Person should eat *one whole Lamb*) otherwise the Institution of the *Jewish Passover* does not fully typifie our Blessed Saviour's Last Supper.

WHOLE, to every Person, that an Indulgence made them of burning I what should remain, when there could not be of our Blessed Saviour's Sufferings, and

I MIGHT found another Argument from the Etymology of the Words *Partake, Partitipate, &c.* But, if what I have already said will not open the Eyes of those, *who hold of superstitious Vanities*, I shall turn aside from them, as I think I am, as a Member of the Established Church, in Duty bound, to caution all Persons, not to give ear to any Religious verbal Disputes, upon any account whatsoever, where the *Honour* of God is not like to be slandered, by the Depreciating our Religion. And even then I hold it the most advisable, rather than enter into Disputes with the *Papists*, for the Generality of Protestants, to make this their sole Reply——When you produce Answers to the Authors who have wrote so well against Popery ; then, and not until then, I will be at leisure to dispute with you ; or else be of your Opinion, unless some other Person vindicate our Church's Cause for me.



F I N I S.

H

I might send another Answer
from the Hymnology of the Words Pa-
ter, Patris, &c. But if what I
have already said will not open the Eyes
of those who hold of superstitious Notions,
I shall turn aside from them, as I
think I am, as a Member of the Establishment
of Church, in Duty bound, to caution
all Persons, not to give ear to any Re-
ligious verbal Disputes, upon any ac-
count whatsoever, while the Answer of
God is not like to be hindered, by
Disputing our Religion. And even
then I hold it the most advisable, rather
than enter into Disputes with the Papists,
for the Generality of Protestants, to make
this their sole Reply.—When you pro-
duce Answers to those who have
wrote so well, as they, then, and
not until then, I am content to
dispute with you, for the best of your Op-
inion, unless some other Person vindicate
our Church's Cause for me.



F W N 12

H